

INTERVIEW SUMMARY UNDER 37 CFR §1.133 AND MPEP §713.04

A telephonic interview in the above-referenced case was conducted on May 4, 2005 between the Examiner and the Applicants' representatives William James and Clover Huang. The Final Office Action mailed on January 11, 2005 was discussed. Specifically, the rejections of claims 1, 12, 13, 15, and 17 in light of Bernardo, Kelly, and Colvin and the proposed amendments set forth herein were discussed with the intent to place the claims in better condition for allowance or appeal. The Examiner suggested amending the preamble to describe the environment in which the claimed invention operates. The Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for his time and attention in this case.

REMARKS

Claims 16 and 20 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 12, 13, 15, 17, 23, and 24 have been amended to clarify the subject matter regarded as the invention. Claims 1-15, 17-19, and 21-28 are pending.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-6, 10-13, 15-17, and 20-28 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bernardo in view of Kelly.

The Examiner has rejected claims 7-9, 14, and 18-19 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bernardo in view of Kelly and further in view of Colvin.

The rejection is respectfully traversed. With respect to claim 1, Bernardo describes a website generation tool that prompts a user to select features and options for the website. Bernardo describes how the “site creator may be prompted for certain data to complete the template fields” at column 7, lines 18-36. Kelly describes binding a user seeking unauthorized access to a target system to a false interface. Neither Bernardo nor Kelly teaches “generating fictitious computer file system content for a computing system configured to provide, to an intruder who has gained or is attempting to gain unauthorized access to a network with which the computing system is associated, a deception environment in which the intruder is allowed to access at least part of the generated fictitious computer file system content to keep the intruder from gaining access to a protected network resource located outside the deception environment,” including “automatically selecting at least one data item from the collection,” as recited in claim 1. Support for the amendment to claim 1 may be found, without limitation, in the above-captioned application at page 14, line 18 to page 16, line 17. As such, claim 1 is believed to be allowable.

Claims 2-15, 17-19, 21-22, and 25-28 depend from claim 1 and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

In addition, with respect to claims 12-15, neither Bernardo nor Kelly describes “intentionally” introducing a spelling error “to make the deception environment appear more realistic by ensuring that at least some of the generated file system content is not entirely free of spelling errors,” as recited in claims 12-14. In addition, neither Bernardo nor Kelly describes

“intentionally” introducing a grammatical error “to make the deception environment appear more realistic by ensuring that at least some of the generated file system content is not entirely free of grammatical errors,” as recited in claim 15.

With respect to claim 17, neither Bernardo nor Kelly describes “selecting the at least one data item is based at least in part on the relative probability of occurrence of the at least one data item to make the deception environment more realistic by ensuring that data items occur with the frequency one would expect in a real, non-deception computing environment associated with network.” Support for the amendment to claim 17 may be found, without limitation, in the above-captioned application at page 25, line 24 to page 27, line 17. As such, claims 12-15 and 17 are believed to be allowable for the additional reasons stated.

Like claim 1, claims 23 and 24 recite “generating fictitious computer file system content for a computing system configured to provide, to an intruder who has gained or is attempting to gain unauthorized access to a network with which the computing system is associated, a deception environment in which the intruder is allowed to access at least part of the generated fictitious computer file system content to keep the intruder from gaining access to a protected network resource located outside the deception environment,” including “automatically selecting at least one data item from a collection of data items available to be inserted into the template.” As such, claims 23 and 24 are believed to be allowable.

Reconsideration of the application and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested based on the preceding remarks. If at any time the Examiner believes that an interview would be helpful, please contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 5/10/05

Clover Huang
Clover Huang
Registration No. 55,285
V 408-973-2594
F 408-973-2595

VAN PELT, YI & JAMES LLP
10050 N. Foothill Blvd., Suite 200
Cupertino, CA 95014



Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. RECOP002

Application No.: 09/616,805 First Named Applicant: Michael Lyle
Examiner: Syed Zia Art Unit: 2131 Status of Application: Pending

Tentative Participants:

(1) Examiner Zia (2) William James of Van Pelt, Yi & James
(3) Clover Huang of Van Pelt, Yi & James (4) _____

Proposed Date of Interview: May 4, 2005 Proposed Time: 2pm (EST) ☐ (AM) ☒ (PM)

Type of Interview Requested:

(1) ☒ Telephonic (2) ☐ Personal (3) ☐ Video Conference

Exhibit To Be Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ YES ☒ NO
If yes, provide brief description: _____

Issues To Be Discussed

Issues (Rej., Obj., etc)	Claims/ Fig. #s	Prior Art	Discussed	Agreed	Not Agreed
(1) <u>Rej.</u>	<u>1, 12, 13, 15, 17</u>	<u>Bernardo, Kelly, Colvin</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(2) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(3) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(4) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> Continuation Sheet Attached					

Brief Description of Arguments to be Presented:

- With respect to claim 1, the cited references do not disclose automatically selecting, nor do the cited references disclose the additional limitations of claim 12, 13, 15, and 17.

An interview was conducted on the above-identified application on _____.

NOTE: This form should be completed by applicant and submitted to the examiner in advance of the interview (see MPEP § 713.01).

This application will not be delayed from issue because of applicant's failure to submit a written record of this interview. Therefore, applicant is advised to file a statement of the substance of this interview (37 CFR 1.133(b)) as soon as possible.

Clover Huang
Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature
Clover Huang

Examiner/SPE Signature

Typed/Printed Name of Applicant or Representative
55,285

Registration Number, if applicable

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.133. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 21 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.